

Proposals for the test of the isospin invariance in the pion-nucleon interaction at low energy

Evangelos Matsinos, Günther Rasche

Abstract

This work elaborates on former remarks of ours regarding two sets of predictions for the observables of the charge-exchange reaction $\pi^-p \rightarrow \pi^0n$ at low energy (pion laboratory kinetic energy $T \leq 100$ MeV). The first prediction is obtained via the triangle identity from the results of fits to low-energy $\pi^\pm p$ elastic-scattering data, whereas the second is based on the same analysis of the combined low-energy π^+p and charge-exchange databases. Assuming the integrity of the data used in our fits (i.e., the absence of significant systematic effects in the determination of the absolute normalisation of the datasets) and the insignificance of residual effects in the electromagnetic corrections, a significant difference between these two sets of predictions may be interpreted as departure from the isospin invariance in the low-energy πN interaction. We examine the sensitivity of the standard low-energy observables to the effect, and identify the kinematical regions which are promising for experimental survey. Accurate experiments under the suggested conditions will differentiate between the predictions, and thus provide an independent test of the isospin invariance in the low-energy πN interaction.

PACS 2010: 13.75.Gx; 25.80.Dj; 25.80.Gn; 11.30.-j

Key words: πN elastic scattering; πN charge exchange; isospin invariance; isospin breaking

1 Introduction

Were the isospin invariance fulfilled in the hadronic part of the pion-nucleon (πN) interaction, two (complex) scattering amplitudes (namely the isospin $I = 3/2$ amplitude f_3 and the $I = 1/2$ amplitude f_1) would suffice in accounting for the three low-energy πN reactions, i.e., for the two elastic-scattering (ES) reactions $\pi^\pm p \rightarrow \pi^\pm p$ and for the π^-p charge-exchange (CX) reaction $\pi^-p \rightarrow \pi^0n$. In that case, the π^+p reaction would involve f_3 , whereas the π^-p ES and CX reactions would be described by the linear combinations $(2f_1 + f_3)/3$ and $\sqrt{2}(f_3 - f_1)/3$, respectively. Evidently, the following expression (known

as ‘triangle identity’) relates the hadronic amplitudes f_{π^+p} , f_{π^-p} , and f_{CX} :

$$f_{\pi^+p} - f_{\pi^-p} = \sqrt{2}f_{\text{CX}} . \quad (1)$$

The isospin invariance in the low-energy πN interaction (pion laboratory kinetic energy $T \leq 100$ MeV) was addressed in several works over the past 25 years [1,2,3,4,5,6]. Assuming the integrity of the input data used therein (i.e., the absence of significant systematic effects in the determination of the absolute normalisation of the datasets) and the insignificance of residual effects in the electromagnetic (EM) corrections, these studies established isospin breaking, and agreed well among themselves regarding the size of the ‘anomaly’ at low energy, reporting a 5–10 % effect in the scattering amplitude. Contrary to the findings of these studies, calculations conducted within the framework of the heavy-baryon Chiral-Perturbation Theory [7] placed the isospin-breaking effects in the πN interaction around the 1 % level.

A number of approaches for the investigation of the phenomenon by means of analyses of the low-energy πN measurements have been put forward.

- In Ref. [1], the π^-p CX scattering amplitude f_{CX} , obtained from the (very few, at that time when the paper appeared) π^-p CX measurements, was compared with corresponding predictions obtained via Eq. (1) from an analysis of the two ES reactions.
- References [2,3,4,5] rested upon a comparison between the π^-p CX measurements and corresponding predictions for the low-energy π^-p CX observables - i.e., for the differential cross section (DCS), for the analysing power (AP), and for the total cross section (TCS) - obtained from the fitted values of the parameters of the hadronic model of this programme (ETH model) and from the Hessian matrices of the fits to ES measurements.
- A third approach, the one this work relates to, was implemented a few years ago [6], featuring the comparison between two sets of predictions for the observables of the π^-p CX reaction ¹: one based on fits to the ES database (DB), denoted henceforth as (DB_{+/-}), and the other extracted from fits to the π^+p and the π^-p CX measurements, comprising a DB which we denote as DB_{+/0}. Significant differences between these two sets of predictions may be interpreted as evidence of the violation of the isospin invariance in the low-energy πN interaction.

¹ As the parameterisation of the standard spin-isospin s - and p -wave phase shifts lies at the basis of our modelling, we need to combine the DBs of at least two low-energy πN reactions in order to determine both isospin amplitudes (f_1 and f_3). This restriction does not necessarily apply to other approaches, e.g., to the method of Ref. [1], which can determine the scattering amplitude f_{CX} directly from the π^-p CX measurements alone.

The question arises as to which of the three low-energy π^-p CX observables is best suited to differentiating between the two sets of predictions of Ref. [6]. Also relevant in this context is the kinematical region, i.e., the (T, θ) domain - θ being the centre-of-momentum (CM) scattering angle - which is best suited to differentiating between the predictions for that observable. These two questions (i.e., best-suited observable, best-suited kinematical region) comprise the subject of this work. The hope is that this short note will direct any future experimental activity towards a reduced kinematical region for the most promising observable(s).

But why are new π^-p CX measurements called for? Why should one not split the available low-energy DB_0 into two subsets, namely measurements which would be used in the fits and measurements which would be used in the hypothesis testing, and proceed with the proposed test? We argue as follows. To start with, any such splitting of the existing DB_0 would be arbitrary; in addition, due to the different sensitivity of the low-energy π^-p CX measurements to the effect under investigation, one could influence the result of the test by skilfully manipulating the two subsets of the DB_0 . Any such approach would be tainted as ‘hypothesis testing under foreknowledge’, a controversial subject in statistical analyses. One could randomly select the two subsets from the pool of the available experiments, but the chances are that (regardless of the result of the test) any outcome would be prone to criticism. Although it is rather unclear at the present time where they could be conducted, we believe that new measurements are indispensable in order to settle down the subject of the isospin invariance in the low-energy πN interaction. To reliably confirm or refute the validity of an effect observed in a statistical analysis of data, the recommended approach is to ‘reset the time’, acquire new measurements, and investigate whether that effect persists.

For the sake of brevity, a prediction or a set of predictions, obtained from the results of the fits to the $DB_{+/-}$, will be named ‘prediction(s) A’ in the following; similarly, a prediction or a set of predictions, obtained from the results of the fits to the $DB_{+/0}$, will be named ‘prediction(s) B’.

2 Method

The details about the fitting procedure, including the experimental input, can be found in Ref. [6], ZRH19 solution (version v2). Predictions for the π^-p CX DCS and AP will be obtained on a (T, θ) grid, where T will be varied between 10 and 100 MeV (with an increment of 5 MeV) and θ between 0 and 180° (with an increment of 5°). At each grid point, one million Monte-Carlo (MC) events will be generated for each m_σ mass (see Ref. [6]), using the fitted values of the parameters of the ETH model and the Hessian matrix of

each fit. As always, the MC generation will be based on the standard routines CORSET and CORGEN of the CERN Program Library, see item V122 in Ref. [8]: the former evaluates the ‘square root’ of the Hessian matrix, which is required as input to the latter; the output of CORGEN in each MC event is a set of correlated normally-distributed random numbers, which lead to the model-parameter vector for that event.

Corresponding (i.e., involving the same (T, θ) grid point) predictions v_1 and v_2 are compared by means of two quantities. The first quantity measures the compatibility of the two values: the absolute normalised difference of v_1 and v_2 is defined as

$$d = \frac{|v_1 - v_2|}{\sqrt{(\delta v_1)^2 + (\delta v_2)^2}} , \quad (2)$$

where δv_1 and δv_2 denote the root-mean-square (rms) uncertainties of v_1 and v_2 , respectively. In our recent analyses, we adopted the 2.5σ level (in the normal distribution) as the outset of statistical significance. Also in this work, two predictions v_1 and v_2 will be considered significantly different if their absolute normalised difference d exceeds 2.5.

If the uncertainties of the measurements, on which the hypothesis testing relies, could be made arbitrarily small, then the only quantity needed in this report would be the absolute normalised difference of Eq. (2); however, this is hardly the case in scattering measurements. The dominant source of systematic uncertainty in the low-energy πN experimentation is associated with the normalisation uncertainty of the datasets: at the present time, the average normalisation uncertainty (over the reported results) of the $\pi^- p$ CX DCS experiments at low energy is about 5.8 %. To be able to differentiate between the predictions A and B with confidence, an experiment must have a normalisation uncertainty which is significantly smaller than the difference between the predictions. Making use of the significance level of 2.5σ , it follows that an experiment (measuring a $\pi^- p$ CX observable) with the current average normalisation uncertainty can differentiate between predictions which are at least 2.5×5.8 % apart, i.e., more than about 15 % apart. In summary, a significant difference between two predictions is not the only issue; the predictions must also be well-separated, so that the experiment have resolving power. (Of course, the statistical uncertainty of the measurements is also relevant. Regarding this point, the assumption is that the data acquisition spans a temporal interval extensive enough so that the systematic effects - i.e., the normalisation uncertainty - become dominant.)

Consequently, a second quantity needs to be introduced into the study: the ‘symmetrised relative difference’ (also known as ‘symmetric absolute percent-

age error') between the predictions v_1 and v_2 , defined as

$$w = 2 \frac{|v_1 - v_2|}{|v_1| + |v_2|} . \quad (3)$$

(In this work, $v_1, v_2 \geq 0$ in all cases. The value of 0 will be assigned to w when $v_1 = v_2 = 0$, as the case is for the AP at $\theta = 0$ and 180° .)

Maps of the quantity w on the (T, θ) grid for those of the values v_1 and v_2 which are significantly different ($d \geq 2.5$) are expected to reveal which of the π^-p CX observables are effective in differentiating between the predictions A and B, and to identify the kinematical regions which are promising in the hypothesis testing proposed in this work.

Predictions for the π^-p CX TCS will also be obtained between $T = 10$ and 100 MeV, with an increment of 5 MeV. Finally, one additional quantity, as potentially effective in differentiating between the two sets of predictions, namely the position (i.e., the T value) of the π^-p CX s - and p -wave interference minimum (destructive interference of the s - and the p -wave parts of f_{CX}), will be considered.

3 Results

The results for the π^-p CX DCS are displayed in Fig. 1. The difference between the predictions A and B is significant almost everywhere on the (T, θ) grid. The promising kinematical region involves the maximisation of w : this occurs in forward scattering ($\theta \lesssim 30^\circ$) at energies neighbouring the s - and p -wave interference minimum. As a matter of fact, this region overlaps with the (T, θ) domain explored in the FITZGERALD86 experiment [9]. Despite the fact that such an experiment is anything but easy (the DCS at the s - and p -wave interference minimum is below $10 \mu\text{b}/\text{sr}$), we recommend the repetition of the FITZGERALD86 experiment. On either side of the minimum, the difference between the two sets of predictions is significant and, furthermore, the predictions are well-separated, so that an experiment with the current average (for low-energy π^-p CX scattering) normalisation uncertainty will suffice in differentiating between the two sets of predictions. One word of advice: detailed measurements at the interference minimum are not expected to be particularly helpful; for the sake of demonstration, one datapoint suffices. It makes more sense to focus on accurate measurements on either side of the minimum, where the separability of the two predictions is enticing (e.g., one measurement around 36.5 MeV, another around 51.5 MeV).

The results for the π^-p CX AP are displayed in Fig. 2. The difference between the predictions A and B is not significant in the larger part of the




Fig. 1. Map of the quantity w of Eq. (3), representing a measure of separability of the two sets of predictions for the π^-p CX DCS for $10 \leq T \leq 100$ MeV and $0 \leq \theta \leq 180^\circ$. The promising kinematical regions correspond to maximal w values. The difference between the predictions is statistically significant almost everywhere on the (T, θ) grid. For the 66 (out of 703) (T, θ) grid points where $d < 2.5$, the quantity w of Eq. (3) was set to 0.

(T, θ) grid. On the other hand, measurements within the triangular domain, defined by the (T, θ) points: (10 MeV, 0°), (10 MeV, 180°), and (40 MeV, 0°), can differentiate between the two sets of predictions (also notice the ‘island’ in forward scattering around 51.5 MeV). As the AP is essentially a ratio of cross sections, many systematic effects (which find their way into the DCS measurements) drop out. On average, the normalisation uncertainties of AP datasets are smaller than those of DCS datasets, and are dominated by the uncertainty in the target polarisation (which is usually around 3%). Unfortunately, very few low-energy measurements of the π^-p CX AP (a mere ten datapoints) are available at the present time [10,11]; furthermore, these measurements had been acquired close to the maximal T value allowed in our analyses, i.e., in a kinematical region which, according to Fig. 2, is not at all promising in connection with the hypothesis testing proposed in this work.

Analysing power




Fig. 2. Same as Fig. 1 for the π^-p CX AP. The AP identically vanishes at $\theta = 0$ and 180° .

The results for the π^-p CX TCS are displayed in Fig. 3. The difference between the two sets of predictions is statistically significant in the entire T domain, yet the predictions are not well-separated. The quantity w of Eq. (3) ranges between about 13.4 (at $T = 10$ MeV) and 3.0 (at $T = 100$ MeV) %. To be able to differentiate between the predictions, an experiment, measuring the π^-p CX TCS at $T \approx 10$ MeV, must be accompanied by a normalisation uncertainty of no more than about 5 %; this is not trivial. The demands on the normalisation uncertainty at $T = 40$ and 95 MeV, representing the range of the T values (below 100 MeV) of the only relevant recent experiment [12], are more stringent: 4.4 and 1.4 %, respectively.

The results for the π^-p CX DCS at $\theta = 0^\circ$ around the s - and p -wave interference minimum are displayed in Fig. 4. The two predictions disagree regarding the T position of the minimum: prediction A places it at $T = 42.21(11)$ MeV; prediction B favours $T = 44.33(14)$ MeV. (This difference of about 2 MeV was first addressed in Ref. [1], see Fig. 3 and the relevant text therein.)




Fig. 3. The two sets of predictions for the π^-p CX TCS; lower band: predictions A, upper band: predictions B. The difference between the predictions is statistically significant in the entire T domain, yet (owing to the present-day normalisation uncertainty of low-energy πN experiments) these sets are not well-separated.

4 Discussion

In a sizeable portion of the kinematical region at low energy, the two sets of predictions obtained for π^-p CX observables - namely the one based on the results of fits to the $DB_{+/-}$ (predictions A) and the other based on those of the fits to the $DB_{+/0}$ (predictions B) - are significantly different, i.e., different at the significance level assumed in our recent works (2.5σ effect in the normal distribution, corresponding to a p-value of about $1.24 \cdot 10^{-2}$). To be able to differentiate between these predictions, and thus provide an independent test of the isospin invariance in the πN interaction below $T = 100$ MeV, an experiment must have sufficient resolving power. At the present time, the average normalisation uncertainty of π^-p CX datasets at low energy is about 5.8 %. Therefore, to be reliably differentiated by an experiment with this normalisation uncertainty, the predictions A and B must be separated by more than about 15 %.




Fig. 4. The two sets of predictions for the π^-p CX DCS at $\theta = 0^\circ$ around the s - and p -wave interference minimum; blue band: predictions A, yellow band: predictions B.

Figures 1 and 2 show maps of the symmetrised relative difference w of Eq. (3) between the two sets of predictions for the DCS and for the AP, respectively; these two plots should be useful in the preparation of experiments aiming at the test of the isospin invariance in the low-energy πN interaction. Figure 3 shows the predictions A and B for measurements of the TCS. One additional quantity has been explored, namely the T position of the s - and p -wave interference minimum: the two predictions for the DCS at $\theta = 0^\circ$ are displayed in Fig. 4.

Assuming the integrity of the input data used in our fits (i.e., the absence of significant systematic effects in the determination of the absolute normalisation of the datasets) and the insignificance of residual effects in the EM corrections, the interpretation of the result of the hypothesis testing, proposed in this work, is straightforward.

- Compatibility of new experimental results for π^-p CX observables with prediction A and incompatibility with prediction B adds a question mark

to the issue of the isospin breaking in the low-energy πN interaction.

- The opposite, i.e., incompatibility with prediction A and compatibility with prediction B, provides support for the isospin-breaking scenario, as promulgated in Refs. [1,2,3,4,5,6].

Predictions for the low-energy πN observables (DCS, AP, and TCS) for the three πN reactions are simple to obtain, free of charge, and available within a few days of a request. Unlike the predictions obtained from dispersion relations, our estimates are accompanied by uncertainties which reflect the statistical and systematic fluctuation of the fitted experimental data.

The figures of this paper have been created with MATLAB[®] (The MathWorks, Inc., Natick, Massachusetts, United States).

References

- [1] W.R. Gibbs, Li Ai, W.B. Kaufmann, ‘Isospin breaking in low-energy pion-nucleon scattering’, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 74 (1995) 3740–3743. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.74.3740
- [2] E. Matsinos, ‘ πN scattering below 100 MeV’, *πN Newsl.* 13 (1997) 132–137.
- [3] E. Matsinos, ‘Isospin violation in the low-energy πN interaction’, *Phys. Rev. C* 56 (1997) 3014–3025. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevC.56.3014
- [4] E. Matsinos, W.S. Woolcock, G.C. Oades, G. Rasche, A. Gashi, ‘Phase-shift analysis of low-energy $\pi^\pm p$ elastic-scattering data’, *Nucl. Phys. A* 778 (2006) 95–123. DOI: 10.1016/j.nuclphysa.2006.07.040
- [5] E. Matsinos, G. Rasche, ‘Analysis of the low-energy $\pi^- p$ charge-exchange data’, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* 28 (2013) 1350039. DOI: 10.1142/S0217751X13500395
- [6] E. Matsinos, G. Rasche, ‘Update of the phase-shift analysis of the low-energy πN data’, [arXiv:1706.05524](https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.05524) [[nucl-th](https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.05524)].
- [7] M. Hoferichter, B. Kubis, Ulf-G. Meißner, ‘Isospin violation in low-energy pion-nucleon scattering revisited’, *Nucl. Phys. A* 833 (2010) 18–103. DOI: 10.1016/j.nuclphysa.2009.11.012
- [8] CERNLIB - CERN Program Library Short writeups, 1996; available from <https://root.cern.ch/sites/d35c7d8c.web.cern.ch/files/cernlib.pdf>
- [9] D.H. Fitzgerald et al., ‘Forward-angle cross sections for pion-nucleon charge exchange between 100 and 150 MeV/c’, *Phys. Rev. C* 34 (1986) 619–626. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevC.34.619
- [10] J.C. Staško, Ph.D. dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1993.

- [11] C.V. Gaulard et al., ‘Analyzing powers for the $\pi^-p \rightarrow \pi^0n$ reaction across the $\Delta(1232)$ resonance’, Phys. Rev. C 60 (1999) 024604. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevC.60.024604
- [12] J. Breitschopf et al., ‘Pionic charge exchange on the proton from 40 to 250 MeV’, Phys. Lett. B 639 (2006) 424–428. DOI: 10.1016/j.physletb.2006.07.009